



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

of war better than other men should, he felt, be the first to advance the cause of peace. When he announced that that very day a treaty of unlimited arbitration with France, similar to the Anglo-American treaty, had been completed, which might be ratified within ten days, Northerners and Southerners alike arose from their seats with one impulse, and with a storm of cheers—the Rebel yell and the Yankee war-cry mingling together—acclaimed the announcement. Peace had her victory that day at Manassas, and the Blue and the Gray fought on the same side, and both won.

### The Chamizal Arbitration.

The outcome of the arbitration of the boundary dispute between this country and Mexico, involving the question of title to the Chamizal tract, containing about 600 acres, at El Paso, Texas, has been a rather curious one. The United States, in accordance with the treaty agreed upon, appointed one Commissioner, Mexico one, and the third was a Canadian jurist chosen by the two governments. The question was to determine what is the present boundary between the United States and Mexico at that point, and thus whether the Chamizal tract belongs to the one or the other country. The decision of the arbitrators was to be final.

The question, which is an old one, arose because of the behavior of the Rio Grande in changing its bed, which is not now the same that it was in 1852. The river has moved to the south, and thrown up this tract of six hundred acres, formerly Mexican territory, and belonging to the city of Juarez, and made it a part of the territory of El Paso, which city has extended its jurisdiction over the accretions of land thrown up by the river. In the former treaties of 1848 and 1853 the boundary line was fixed in what was then the bed of the river, and it was provided by the later treaty of 1884 that the normal bed of the river should remain the permanent boundary, notwithstanding any alterations in the banks or in the course of the river, provided such changes were due to the slow and gradual erosion and deposit of alluvium. On the other hand, if the changes were more violent and a new river bed was thus cut, or of two or more channels one was deepened and became the principal one, the dividing line was to remain the same as that fixed by the surveys of 1852.

Here was the rock on which the arbitration struck. It was no easy matter to determine whether the building up of the Chamizal tract on the north side of the river was by slow deposit of alluvium in the sense meant by the treaty of 1884, or by more sudden change in the course of the river. The former alternative was held by the American agent and counsel, the latter by the Mexican. The arbitrators were divided in their judgment after hearing all the arguments in the case. Two

of them, the umpire and the Mexican Commissioner, who rendered the decision, took the ground that all that portion of the tract built up before the great floods of 1864 had been formed by gradual accretion, and that the portion formed by the floods of 1864 and by accretions thereafter had been by more sudden change. So they divided the tract at the line of the river bed in 1864, giving what was north of this line to the United States and that which was south of it to Mexico.

The United States Commissioner rendered a dissenting opinion, holding that under the treaty of submission the Arbitral Commission had no right to divide the tract, and that the judgment was incapable of execution because the line of division of 1864 could not now be located. With this view the United States agent, W. C. Dennis, agreed, and he filed a protest against the award on the ground that it departed from the terms of submission; that it was indefinite in its terms and impossible of application; that it failed to give the reasons on which it was based, and because of essential error of law and of fact. On several points in the judgment on which the umpire and the United States Commissioner agreed, the Mexican Commissioner also filed a dissenting opinion.

The outcome on the whole seems to have been generally unsatisfactory, though there is no doubt that the arbitrators did their work conscientiously and tried to determine as best they could under the circumstances where right and justice lay. The decision, if it stands, will establish Mexican sovereignty north of the Rio Grande over a considerable part of the southern portion of El Paso, and this will inevitably result in confusion and possibly considerable friction in administration. The two governments will doubtless carefully consider this phase of the outcome, and are certain to be able, through the channels of diplomacy or otherwise, to reach some arrangement that will be satisfactory to both.

One lesson of this arbitration is that international disputes of any importance ought no longer to be referred to special joint commissions created *ad hoc*, on which representatives of the two litigants serve, but to the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague. Nations should not be judges in their own cause. Another lesson, as some able students of international law think, is that the outcome of this case proves once more the essential imperfection and unsatisfactoriness of arbitration as always more or less involving compromise, and that as soon as possible an international court of justice should be set up.

The arbitration, unsatisfactory as the outcome has been, does not seem to us to have been a failure. It has occasioned the thorough study of the facts lying at the basis of the controversy, and shown how difficult the question was. Perhaps the two governments, if they are unwilling to accept the award, on the grounds given

by the United States agent, will agree to refer the whole question to the court at The Hague or come to some agreement by which the tract in dispute may be brought under the jurisdiction of the United States in return for a suitable money consideration.

### The Voice of the Christian Church.

With increasing frequency and power the great gatherings of the Christian Church in all parts of the world are uttering their demand for the abolition of war and the establishment of a permanent system of judicial settlement of such international controversies as cannot be adjusted by direct negotiations or avoided altogether through the influence of a spirit of justice, friendliness, and mutual service. Among recent utterances of this kind the following resolution adopted by the American Board's Japan Mission, at its thirty-ninth annual meeting, May 30, 1911, is singularly opportune and impressive:

We, members of the Japan Mission of the American Board, at our thirty-ninth annual meeting, view with deep solicitude the persistence of sinister rumors alleging an impending rupture of the traditional friendship between Japan and the United States. We believe that both the government and the people of Japan in reality still hold the United States in warm regard because of the sympathetic attitude toward Japan which has in past years characterized the diplomacy of our Government.

We believe, moreover, that, in spite of certain indications to the contrary, both the Government and people of the United States still cherish warm admiration for Japan. We believe that our country is second to none in its desire for international peace based on righteousness and justice and for the establishment of The Hague Tribunal as a recognized court for the settlement of all international difficulties.

We rejoice in the growing Peace Movement in Japan, and in the increasing evidences of a calm judicial spirit among its leaders, a spirit which refuses to exaggerate slight offenses, to countenance a narrow nationalism, or to regard exceptional unfriendly utterances of individuals as indicating the spirit of the American people.

We rejoice in the suggestion of an unlimited arbitration treaty between the United States and Japan, and hope that nothing may be allowed to stand in the way of the framing and ratification of such a compact.

We urge upon the trustees of the Carnegie Peace Fund, and upon others who have at heart the maintenance of peace, that suitable provision be made for the transmission of accurate and trustworthy news regarding international questions.

Not less timely and significant is the following statement adopted at the great Baptist World Alliance Conference held in Philadelphia in June, with representatives present from many nations:

This Baptist World Alliance, representing eight millions (8,000,000) and more of Baptists all over the earth, expresses its thankfulness to God for the bright-

ening prospects of the extinction of war and the arrival of universal peace and good will.

The Alliance places on record its profound gratitude to the President of the United States for the proposal of unlimited arbitration in all international disputes, and for his repeated and sustained efforts to get that proposal accepted not only by England, but by other countries also.

The Alliance is also grateful for the cordial and enthusiastic welcome given to that proposal by the British Cabinet and Parliament irrespective of party, and by the representatives of Germany and France, and trusts that nothing will be wanting to establish, at an early date, a permanent arbitral court for the settlement of all questions amongst nations which cannot be disposed of by the ordinary methods of diplomacy.

Further, the Alliance, recognizing that it is the duty of the subjects of the Prince of Peace to lead in such specific work, rejoices in the response made by our churches all over the world to these endeavors, and urges them to continue to pray for peace, to check everything in the press and in national life calculated to cause strife among the nations, to protest against the extension of the war field into the air, and to promote in every way possible the spirit of brotherhood and love.

### Editorial Notes.

#### Death Knell of War.

When Andrew Carnegie was informed by wire at Skibo Castle, at the end of June, of the announcement of the agreement between the United States and Great Britain to submit all disputes between them to arbitration, he at once telegraphed to the London Bureau of the *New York American* the following message:

"This is the most beneficent announcement ever made in the history of man, for the death knell of war has been sounded. Our English-speaking race abolished slavery and abolished dueling, and other nations followed, or are rapidly following. So will they follow in regard to men killing each other. President Taft is the ruler who revealed the path to victory and gave the word of command. He thus becomes the world's greatest benefactor. Now for Germany, France, and the Netherlands, with all of whom our country now is negotiating. With these nations won our work is done. It is glory enough for our Republic that she is the leader in this sublime campaign."

Mr. Carnegie is right in saying that the death knell of war has been sounded. But with Germany, France, and the Netherlands won (the two latter are already won, and the latest reports indicate that Germany is well over) our work will be far from done. We must not only bind the nations together by treaties of unlimited arbitration, but also, if these treaties are to prove inviolable in practice, we must root out by long-continued education and moral training the underlying